



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

—TN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/498,363 02/04/00 NAOUMENKO

Y 1247-0851-6V

□

IM52/0926

□

EXAMINER

Oblon Spivak McClelland Maier & Neustadt
Fourth Floor
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington VA 22202

FERGUSON, L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

11

DATE MAILED:

09/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/498,363	NAOUMENKO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lawrence D Ferguson	1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Examiner regrets the untimely reopening of prosecution of this case. However, new prior art has been found and is applied to the claims as follows.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over De Paoli (U.S. 5,132,162) in view of Rothe et al (U.S. 5,137,770).

4. De Paoli teaches a laminated glazing for a window which includes two or more sheets of rigid glass and an interlayer material (abstract). The glazing can exhibit a structure with an offset edge to be able to be mounted in a known way that is flush with the body as applicant instantly claims (column 3, lines 52-54). The reference teaches that an adhesive may be added to the interlayer to cause adhesion to the rigid sheets (column 3, lines 58-60).

The difference between the reference and the application is that the reference does not teach that a cement element can be adhered to the intermediate element for securing the glazing to the body or that the intermediate element is made of aluminum, stainless steel, epoxy or phenolic, unsaturated polyester resin containing reinforcement fillers.

Rothe teaches the benefit of adding cement to a laminated glazing having glass panes for improvement of water tightness (column 1, lines 26-29. This is a conventional application as explained by Rothe in paragraphs 2-4 of column 1. Rothe also teaches that the intermediate element can be made of metals such as aluminum and steel (column 11, lines 1-6). The Rothe reference further includes the use of glass fiber strengthened plastics as reinforcing materials. Adhesive is also used in Rothe to adhere the cement to the other layers. The laminated glazing of either Rothe or De Paoli can be applied to windows, such as those in automobiles or plane cockpits. The intermediate element of Rothe shows the same intermediate elements as applicant claims and provides the same tensile strength as instantly claimed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the glazing of De Paoli provided with the intermediate element and cement of Rothe because Rothe shows the use of the cement to be conventional and shows it is used for improving the water tightness. It is also obvious to use the intermediate elements in Rothe in place of those used by De Paoli as those cited are conventional and the benefits of using them are well known.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Ferguson whose telephone number is (703) 305-9978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 AM – 4:30PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on (703) 308-0449. Please allow the examiner twenty-four hours to return your call.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-5408 for regular communications and (703) 305-3599 for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2351.



Lawrence D. Ferguson
Examiner
September 24, 2001

CYNTHIA H. KELLY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

